

### **REMARKS**

Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing remarks. Claims 1, 17, 21, 41, 46, 52, 59, and 76 have been amended, and new claims 77-80 are added. Claims 1-80 are pending, with claims 1, 21, 41, and 59 being independent. No new matter has been added.

### **§ 112 Rejection**

Claims 17, 52, 53, and 76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 17, 52, and 76 have been amended to obviate this rejection. Specifically, claim 17 has been amended to recite "TV ride programming," claim 52 has been amended to recite "the set top box," and claim 76 has been amended to depend from claim 75. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully solicited.

### **Alexander Rejection**

Claims 1-5, 8-12, 14-17, 19-26, 29-37, 39-43, 45-49, 52-54, 56-61, 63-67, 70-72, and 74-76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Alexander et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,177,931).

This response first addresses the rejection with respect to for claim groupings: a first group of claims 1-5, 8-12, 14-17, 19, and 20, then a second group of claims 21-26, 29-37, 39, and 40, then a third group of claims 41-43, 45-49, 52-54, and 56-58, and finally, a fourth group of claims 59-61, 63-67, 70-72, and 74-76.

### **Claims 1-5, 8-12, 14-17, 19, and 20**

As amended, independent claim 1 recites a method for enabling user selection and perception of a television (TV) ride. A list of several different TV rides is presented. Each of the different TV rides is associated with a TV ride lineup specifying a sequence of TV programming provided by more than one channel. A TV ride selection from among the list of

TV rides presented is received from a user to whom the list is presented, and the TV ride lineup associated with the TV ride selection is received from a host. The TV ride lineup is accessed and a channel that provides the TV programming is automatically tuned to based on the accessed TV ride lineup.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Alexander fails to disclose or suggest at least presenting a list of several different TV rides, each of the different TV rides being associated with a TV ride lineup specifying a sequence that includes TV programming provided by more than one channel, and receiving from a user to whom the list is presented a TV ride selection from among the list of TV rides presented.

More specifically, Alexander relates to an improvement on an electronic programming guide. [Col. 2, lines 64-65]. The electronic programming guide provides a variety of features including improved viewer interaction capabilities with the electronic programming guide, improved viewer control of video recording of future-scheduled programming, improved features to the electronic programming guide display and navigation, parental control of the electronic programming guide display, improved television program information access by the viewer, improved opportunities for the commercial advertiser to reach the viewer, improved product information access by the viewer, creation of a viewer's profile, and utilization of viewer profile information to customize various aspects of the electronic programming guide, and utilization of viewer profile information to provide customized presentation of advertising to the viewer. [Col. 5, line 56-col. 6, line 59].

In one particular aspect, the electronic programming guide enables user creation of a "watch list." [Col. 10, line 1]. The watch list allows a user to create a list programs the user desires to watch and the TV automatically turns the channel to the program listed on the watch list when that particular program airs. [Col. 10, lines 1-10]. The watch list, however, merely contains a single list of particular television programs a user desires to watch. Thus, the Alexander electronic programming guide fails to present a list of several different TV rides, or receive a TV ride selection from among the list presented.

Accordingly, Alexander fails to disclose or suggest at least presenting a list of several different TV rides, each of the different TV rides is associated with a TV ride lineup specifying a sequence of TV programming provided by more than one channel, and receiving from a user to whom the list is presented a TV ride selection from among the list of TV rides presented. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of amended independent claim 1 and its dependent claims.

**Claims 21-26, 29-37, 39, and 40**

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection with respect to independent claim 21 and its dependent claims.

Similarly to claim 1, claim 21 recites, among other features, a processor for presenting a list of several different TV rides, each of the different TV rides is associated with a TV ride lineup specifying a sequence of TV programming provided by more than one channel, and an interface for receiving from a user to whom the list is presented a TV ride selection from among the list of TV rides presented. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of claim 21, and its dependent claims, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

**Claims 41-43, 45-49, 52-54, and 56-58**

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection with respect to independent claim 41 and its dependent claims.

As amended, independent claim 41 recites receiving a TV ride selection from a set top box, the selection being from a list of TV rides presented, and determining a TV ride lineup in response to the TV ride selection, the TV ride lineup including data for automatically tuning to the TV programming for more than one channel. As discussed above, Alexander describes a watch list that allows a user to create a list programs that the user desires to watch and the TV automatically turns the channel to the program listed on the watch list when that particular program airs. [Col. 10, lines 1-10]. The watch list, however, merely contains a single list of particular television programs a user desires to watch. Thus, the electronic programming guide cannot receive a TV ride selection from a list of TV rides presented, or determine a TV ride

lineup in response to the TV ride selection. Accordingly, Alexander fails to disclose or suggest receiving a TV ride selection from a set top box, the selection being from among a list of several different TV rides presented to a user, and determining a TV ride lineup in response to the TV ride selection, the TV ride lineup including data for automatically tuning to the TV programming for more than one channel.

For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of amended independent claim 41 and its dependent claims.

**Claims 59-61, 63-67, 70-72, and 74-76**

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection with respect to independent claim 59 and its dependent claims.

Similarly to claim 41, claim 59 recites, among other features, an interface for receiving a TV ride selection from a set top box, the selection being from among a list of several different TV rides presented to a user, and a processor for determining a TV ride lineup in response to the TV ride selection, the TV ride lineup including data for automatically tuning to the TV programming for more than one channel. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of claim 59, and its dependent claims, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 41.

**§ 103 Rejection**

Claims 6, 7, 13, 18, 27, 28, 38, 44, 50, 51, 55, 62, 68, and 69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Alexander alone, or in view of Blacketter et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0166248) or Machiro (U.S. Patent No. 6,880, 168).

Blacketter was cited merely for displaying a viewer poll in a window, [Office Action, page 7], and Machiro was cited merely for creating an invitation message prompting particular users to join a chat and transmitting the invitation message to particular users, [Office Action, page 8]. Therefore, neither Blacketter nor Machiro remedy the deficiencies of Alexander discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections at least because Alexander fails to disclose or suggest the features of amended

Applicant : Robert M. Cooper  
Serial No. : 09/867,692  
Filed : May 31, 2001  
Page : 17 of 17

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-165001 / AOLT V 14

independent claims 1, 21, 41, and 59, and, assuming the references can be combined, nothing in Blacketter or Maehiro remedies these deficiencies.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment, including the Office Action's characterizations of the art, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute the rejected claims in further prosecution of this or related applications.

Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Please apply the \$200 fee for excess claims and any other charges or credits to deposit account 06 1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/14/2005

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
W. Karl Renner  
Reg. No. 41,265

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331